

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

"HOW BEAUTIFUL UPON THE MOUNTAINS, ARE THE FEET OF HIM THAT BRINGETH GOOD TIDINGS, THAT PUBLISHETH PEACE."—Isa. lii, 7.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY, AT NO. 2 CHATHAM-SQUARE, BY P. PRICE, AT \$2 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

VOL. II.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1833.

NO. 37.

[The following is the Renunciation of Universalism by the Editor of the *Genius of Liberty*, referred to by us, week before last. Some additional observations on it, by way of notes, will be found at the close of the article.]

RENUNCIATION OF UNIVERSALISM!!

Having become sufficiently established in my doubts of the truth and utility of the Universalist doctrine, as a system, I now think it my duty to lay my dissent before the public.

That this important change in my sentiments and feelings may be the better understood, I shall give a partial or brief history of the operations of my mind. Passing over the reflections of early life, suffice it to say, that I became a preacher of universal salvation, and was ordained as such in Fairfield, Herkimer Co. N. Y. about eight years ago. I believed the doctrine true, and thought, that in proportion as it was propagated, mankind would become good and happy. I preached in different parts far and near; and itinerated over an extensive region of country, suffering the excesses of heat and cold, and the pitiless peltings of stormy skies, and muddy roads. No danger or effort did I consider too great that was possible; for I believe, for a number of years, I should often have rejoiced in the martyr's privilege of attesting my faith.—Some years since, however, I occasionally reflected that, although the doctrine had spread much faster than I had anticipated, it did not seem to produce the effects I had expected.—This gradually cooled my ardor and diminished my zeal, so that for some years I cared but little whether I preached or not. In this state of mind, believing Universalism to be the true sense of the Bible when rightly construed, and being unable to see any considerable good resulting from the system, I was much inclined to doubt divine revelation. I could not go entirely into infidelity, nor feel much confidence in revelation. At length I heard of the bewitching fascinations of the infidelity of New-York; and read most of the eloquent effusions of that woman, who prostituted the splendid gifts, which heaven gave to honor and adorn her sex, to the execrable business of sapping the foundations of social order, and overturning the fair fabric of female honor and happiness, and pouring corruption deep and boundless over all the sacred demarcations that distinguish mankind from brutes.*

At first my mind was awfully contaminated with her sweeping & ruinous principles. But upon more deliberate reflection, I saw the vortex into which such principles must inevitably draw mankind. I saw it would be in the moral world like putting out the sun and moon and every star in the natural, barely because men had eyes of their own to see with. Such was my state of mind two years ago. I saw the necessity of religion, but still had only a cold, dark, and inefficient faith in any. At times, I was extremely unhappy, so much so as almost to wish for death. The conversion of Dr. Stedman, of Mayville, has been a subject with me of much reflection. I knew his former business was very lucrative, and I persuaded myself that he had become externally religious for the sake of still increasing his pecuniary business. For he was such a strong and enlightened infidel that I was persuaded nothing but God could really convert

him to christianity, and I doubted whether God would interpose for any such purpose. But last summer, when I found that same man had abandoned all his lucrative business, and gone into the world to preach—that he had left wealth and affluence and all earthly comforts behind him—when I reflected that he had been avaricious and worldly and sceptical as any other man; and that he was now liberal and kind, and his whole soul now devoted to religion, and was even willing to be a *Methodist*; all this satisfied me that he was indeed converted by the invisible agency of the Holy Spirit. This, together with some other things not necessary to be named, made some peculiarly serious impressions upon my mind. I began to look with renewed and deeper attention upon the system of Universalism as I had professed it. I had seen it rise and spread in all directions. At first I knew of only two or three advocates of the system, now there were hundreds. Thousands were becoming its friends, and I thought it indicated an ultimate triumph over all other systems. So its friends generally seem to believe.

This often induced me to look forward to future generations, and contemplate them and their condition as though they were to be my children. Something would seem to ask, "What will be their social, moral, and religious state? Are the effects of the doctrine *now* (so far as they are visible to observation from the multitudes that profess it) such as to promise any substantial and lasting good to future ages, when it comes to be ultimately universal? Are men more apt to be honest, benevolent, social, kind, humble, tolerant, and pious, in consequence of being converted to Universalism? Are such abandoned and black-hearted wretches, as love to trample in scorn upon every thing sacred, made to tremble and stand abashed by this doctrine? Are the wicked reformed or restrained by its powerful influence?"† Such like questions often crowded upon my mind with such affecting and overwhelming energy, that I looked around with deep solicitude to see its good effects. I began earnestly to review the course generally pursued by Universalists, with a view to judge of the common effects of the doctrine. I ardently desired to see the boasted good, which I and others had ascribed to it. But the more I looked the more I must confess I discovered a moral waste. I had seen the blessed influences of the doctrine spread out often on paper, but I could not see them any where else!§ No—God knows I am honest in this assertion. I do not feel to abuse the denomination, but it is true, that I could not for my life see any good resulting to society from the sentiment. This conviction rolled in upon my mind and my feelings with tremendous effect. Alas—thought I, have I been spending "my labor for that which satisfieth not!" Are all my efforts useless, and only tending to make looser the restraints of religion and virtue? I recollected of delivering a discourse in this place a year ago last winter, published in the 1st volume of the *Genius of Liberty*, designed to arouse Universalists to something like a religious course, if they did not mean indeed to identify their cause with infidelity. I was given to understand that they wanted no such preaching, and although frequently solici-

ted to preach here since, my answer has been substantially, that I would when I was satisfied, they wanted to learn how to become better. But with these impressions, I was obliged still to be a Universalist; for I could not make up my mind fully to be an infidel, and viewed all the doctrines of the orthodox almost with abhorrence. I could much easier have gone into infidelity than orthodoxy. My prejudices were so strong against the orthodox generally, that I misapprehended many of their sentiments, and belittled them all either very ignorant or unprincipled hypocrites.

With such feelings, I concluded one Sunday last summer to go in and hear Mr. Giller of the Presbyterian church of this village. My object principally was to enable myself to expose some of the gross inconsistencies of his doctrine. But he preached on practical social duties; I was highly pleased and edified with the whole discourse. In the afternoon I went again, and discovered as I thought some errors, but in consequence of the happy effect of his first sermon, I could not feel it in my heart to find any fault with him before the public; for I found myself beginning to respect his feelings, which I had formerly sported with in a very wanton and cruel manner; and had verily thought I was serving God in so doing. Soon after I heard him again, and finally was induced to hear as often as possible; for the more I heard the more satisfied I was that his grand object was not to oppress and injure human society as I had madly supposed, but to uphold practical religion and morality, and thus subserve the best interests of men, as well as to promote the declarative glory of God. I had certainly supposed that Presbyterian clergymen were the most unprincipled men in the world, though from their superior literary attainments, I did not hold them in such perfect contempt as I did the Methodist clergy. But upon becoming acquainted with the above individual, I was constrained to perceive that I had been blind with prejudice; and was further persuaded by degrees that his preaching and general views were useful to the community around him.

Last winter I attended the protracted meeting in this place, to see if indeed they conducted it in the ludicrous and revolting manner represented by their opponents. Candor demands of me the statement that I heard not a single sarcastic expression or unchristian insinuation, or any thing else, more than serious practical preaching, and impressive appeals to sinners to come to Christ and live. There were some things that infidels might not approve, and that abandoned people might condemn; but I think there was nothing that any *christian* could be displeased with.

About this time it began to be talked that I had renounced Universalism. I had not done it, neither had I determined that I should. I was dissatisfied with it, as being not calculated to build up serious and devout societies; but I dared not immediately renounce it, through fear that my objections were the result of some intellectual hallucination, or temporary prejudice, or hypochondriacal affection, and might finally wear off. Being thus circumstanced, I felt it improper for me to urge upon my readers a belief in universal salvation. It was also equally

improper for me to urge objections to the theory until I should become fully established either against or for it. Therefore I took the only course remaining for me, which was to confine my public remarks to subjects not immediately connected with the question; and to urge upon my readers such considerations as I believed would be useful to them.

Although I have for sometime thought I should ultimately renounce the doctrine, yet I was determined not to do so hastily as yet to be fully conscious of doing right. I published an article in the 44th No. 2d volume *Genius of Liberty*, from the *Boston Trumpet*, by a *Restorationist*, which professes to give an account of the religious condition of Universalists generally in New England. The reader is requested to peruse it. The editor of the *Trumpet* asserts that it is a misrepresentation. How it may be in New England, I do not know; but this I know, that it is not a misrepresentation of their religious condition, so far as I know any thing about them.† I would not speak harshly of them.†† My affections have clung to them with almost the grasp of desperation.—Certainly as a people, they deserve no evil at my hands. I only wish to speak of the general effects of the doctrine. I know individuals among them of the most amiable dispositions and characters, that would honor any profession. But I do not think their doctrine ever made them so. I candidly aver in the fear of God, that I do not believe the doctrine ever made a single soul any better than he otherwise would have been, while it has been the means of removing necessary restraints, and giving latitude to thousands, whose propensities and passions needed restraint, whereby they have indulged in criminal pursuits and gone to perdition. I only judge from what I know—from what I have seen, in reference to the general effects of the doctrine. "The tree must be known by its fruits." And after taking the fruits of the tree of universalism into long and deliberate and prayerful consideration, so far as I have ever seen them, I am compelled to conclude the tree is radically defective—that God never designed to give mankind a religion which would do them no good, and about which most of its friends would feel so perfectly indifferent, as universalists generally do about their religion. When I learn of a single drunkard, or swearer, or gambler, or debauchee, or knave being reformed in consequence of the universalist doctrine, I shall think better of its influence than I do now—for it is my solemn opinion that such an instance never occurred. And I would gladly hold up this truth to all the friends of the doctrine, and make it speak out in thunder to their consciences—and then ask them if they will still teach this doctrine to their children?

Being aroused to these considerations, I began to ask again whether the bible did teach universalism in its own plain, unsophisticated construction. In the first place, it is manifest that *hope* and *fear* are the two great sources of human volitions. Hope is powerful when balanced by fear in inducing men to action. Men will never do much for an object because they *hope* for it, unless they *fear* that they shall not obtain it without action. Induce an avaricious man to believe that he shall become rich whether he works or not, and he may ardently *hope* to be so; but such *hope* would never induce him to work. On the other hand, induce him to believe that if he works he shall become rich, and to *fear* that if he does not he will be poor, and this *hope* and *fear* together, will make him active. So when we look impartially into the scriptures, we shall find the *hope* of reward and the *fear* of punishment, every where held forth, as the proper inducements to a good life. These are the inducements; they are parallel through

the bible; the one would have no practical effect without the other. In reference to this point, I have examined Prof. Stewart's learned work on those original terms which define the duration of future happiness and future misery, and I think he clearly shows that the rewards and punishments of a future world are parallel, and of equal duration. I know that most of Universalists deny the existence of even *any* punishment in a future state. But I should certainly think it much fairer for them to say at once, that they did not regard the unvarnished sense of the bible at all, and only used it as a kind of popular mantle in which to dress up a system of palpable infidelity. They may come out with a vengeance on me for saying so much; but if they must, they must—I never shrink from the convictions of right. If any man of sense can read Balfour's Essays, and other writings which I could name, and not be convinced, that materialism and atheism are at the bottom, he can do what I cannot. And I am not accustomed to shrink from an open avowal of my conclusions on account of the frowns or smiles of my fellow beings. What have I on earth to fear? In a few days I shall be in another world! And so will the multitudes that now rage and clamor about opinions. The only object then, worthy of me or any other man, is to do something that will gild the way from earth with peace; and leave with our children some salutary principles to guide them safely amidst the temptations of the world.

I do not intend here to discuss the subject of future punishment, though it is not impossible I may do it hereafter. Suffice it to say, I know of no argument against eternal punishment, that can be drawn from the fair construction of the scriptures.†† And as to the conclusions drawn from known facts, they are as much in favor of the hypothesis, as against it.

Some have pretended that, as I have said and written so much for universal salvation, I have no right to come out against it now. I cling to the system as long as I conscientiously could; and having seen more and more, and reflected more and more on the subject, and its relations and tendencies, I am *fully* satisfied that I ought to abandon it. It must be because I know more than I once did, or less.

Some time in the last winter, I received of Mr. Gillet, Bishop Horne's evidences of revealed religion. I read it with increasing avidity. It was the first work I had ever read in proof of the divine authority of the bible. Every objection that ever I thought of, and many more, were there conclusively answered. The scriptures were supported by evidence that both astonished and overwhelmed my whole mind. I thanked God that I had seen the work.

What have been my experimental impressions since, it may not be necessary to relate at this time.

The idea of separating myself from those who have been my friends, has been indeed a subject of exquisite feeling. But when contrasted with a sense of duty, there was no alternative. Those whose friendship is worth retaining, will not be the less friendly because I pursue the course which my judgment dictates and my conscience approves. From what I have already seen and heard, I have reason to expect my motives will be assailed. Those men whose own motives are mercenary, will impute such to me. I am now prepared in the strength of the Lord Jesus, to bear whatever of calumny or reviling this act may call into being.

And I hope to possess a disposition to forgive all such uncharitable aspersions, as will grow out of the same dark prejudices and anti-christian animosities, which I have felt and cherished with blind and devoted infatuation. May that God whose free grace is as a river, forgive

them and me, and bring them ultimately, by the efficiency of his spirit, to see and feel the power and truth of the religion of Christ.

For some time, I have contemplated, in consequence of my conviction of the utter inefficiency of universalism, to go into private business, and retire from all public life. Were it not for the sweeping prevalence of infidelity, which I deprecate as subversive of the most important interests of men, I think still it would be my choice. But on the whole, I have concluded to follow the still small voice of the Deity, to go where that directs, and do what that requires.

For me to doubt that God has exerted a special influence over my views and feelings for some time past, would be to doubt the evidence of my own sensations. And although these may be fallacious, yet no one can safely disregard what he is made to feel.

If any are astonished at the course I have taken, they are no more astonished than I am. It has been brought about gradually, to be sure, but by the invisible action of agents over which I had no control. If I am to blame for my present impressions, I am as much to blame because the sun shines.

It has been said, and will be reiterated through the country, and I may be thus noticed in the universalist publications, that my object is *popularity*. I do not say that they are actuated by such motives, but admit they are probably as honest as I have been. And if they really possess the charity for which they claim distinction, they will not insinuate any such thing of me. If I have been any way distinguished as a lover of popularity, or if indeed my present course was a very popular one, there might be some small ground for such a suspicion, though no ground for such a charge. But this is not true, as I am able to show that I have recently rejected opportunities to secure a much greater chance for popularity than I can ever expect from this course. If it shall be said that my object is *money*, I shall be able to exhibit *facts*, such as would satisfy any candid mind that it is not the case. I can show that I have pursued a course in my own paper, which I anticipated would subject me to a serious loss. I can also show that for some time past, I have had inducements of a pecuniary kind held out to me as a promulgator of universalism, far greater than I can ever expect from any other connexion. If all this does not satisfy, which kind providence has granted me as I think, for that express purpose, and many think me yet in reality a universalist, professing another sentiment for mercenary purposes, let them consider that this is only saying, that universalism has so little influence over its disciples, that they may profess any thing else for popularity or money! which would be only another argument why I ought to abandon it.

However, none will impute to me such motives of action, except such as know of no other motives of action—that have no principles—no affections—and that never dreamed of doing any thing because it was right! And those who make such insinuations, are always those very men whose sole object in their business is *professedly* money, just as if I had not as good a right to pursue my worldly interests, as other men!

I acknowledge that I have motives of action, but I deny that the expectation of either money or popular applause has any part in this business.

But I have heard men say that Paul and Peter subjected themselves to a whole life of suffering, and death itself, for the purpose of making money! From such men, I expect neither justice nor mercy! Such as never act from pure and good motives, are very apt to think others

do not. Men who are seldom sincere, are apt to suspect the sincerity of others. Men who despise the bible, are apt to think others must despise it too, and such as hate religion, will think others must, and will hate them if they do not.

Let it not be thought that I consider this step of mine of trifling consequence. I have approached it with the most deliberate consideration. Neither do I despise the feelings of hundreds of good friends, who will feel tenderly and grievously affected with this announcement. There are honest and good universalists. Such will feel astonished and grieved. For them, I could drop a tear, but I could not refrain from this act, and still be worthy of their regard. So I feel, and so I must act or be a slave.—God has willed that it should be so; yet let it not be supposed that I feel no affection for good Universalists. I believe there are many such who will go to heaven, though I believe not that the sentiment generally makes men better. Men are not to be punished at all for being universalists, but only for wicked actions. My objections to universalism, are founded mainly upon the fact of its inefficiency to reform the wicked, and to promote the growth and living energy of vital piety.—God has made us free moral agents, and he has made us capable of obtaining a supply of worldly comforts, by the due improvement of our faculties, and of being measurably happy; but without the improvement of these faculties, we cannot secure even the common comforts of this world. So I think the religion of our Lord Jesus Christ, teaches us to expect our future condition will be according to the character we form. This gives to virtue its best encouragement and brightest hopes, and to vice, its most powerful restraint. It attaches the most solemn sanction to the laws of God, and binds in the strongest chains the dearest interests of men. And when we reflect that many men will break over all restraints—will neither regard the laws of honor, or humanity, the holy affections of kindred beings, the tears of the innocent, nor the love of God, the hopes of heaven, nor the terrors of hell, who would wish to diminish the means of restraining the wicked?

The love of God has much in it to interest and affect the heart of a Christian, but it cannot act where it is not. We might go to the pirate, or any cold, malicious, conscience-seared wretch, and preach the love of God to him, and he would still laugh, and whet the murdering knife for another victim.

The grand object of all religion, is to make men good. For this, Jesus came on earth and died. For this, the apostles labored and offered up their lives. For this, the martyrs bled. And to cherish any religion which has not this effect, is to strike a fatal blow at the best interests of our race.

Sincerely and deliberately believing that such is the effect of the universalian doctrine, I appeal to the heart searching God for the purity of my motives, while I hereby publicly renounce the doctrine as unscriptural and of pernicious tendency; and I withdraw from all ecclesiastical connection with the people called universalists.

LEWIS C. TODD.

Jamestown, May 25, 1833.

* Although we have before remarked on this article, the reader, as well as Br. T. will indulge us in a few additional observations as we pass. In the very opening of this communication there is something unaccountable to us. The writer tells us that he "became a preacher of Universal Salvation about eight years ago;" that he believed the doctrine and thought it calculated to render mankind happy, that he exposed himself to the "pitiless peltings of stormy skies and muddy roads" in its defence, deeming "no danger or effort too great" on his part to promulgate it. He was even prepared for the martyr's

doom. And yet in the very next sentence he assures us that although the doctrine had spread far beyond his expectation, it had not produced the anticipated effects; and this had so "cooled his ardor," that "for SOME YEARS he had cared but little whether he preached or not." He "was much inclined to doubt divine revelation altogether;" till at length, it seems, "the bewitching fascinations of the infidelity of New-York" and the "eloquent effusions" of Frances Wright, in reality "awfully contaminated" his "mind."

The chronological inferences in this business, are mysticisms to us. Only eight years in the profession, "through a number" of which he would "have rejoiced in a martyr's privilege of attesting" his "faith," and still, "some years" since had launched his bark upon the doubtful sea of scepticism! What are we to understand from statements like this? What inference shall we draw from them? Does he attach any meaning to the terms by which he aims to express himself, or is he playing at a game of hazard in the use of language? He says in another part of this article, "I have approached this step with the most deliberate consideration!" If he has been thus deliberate, and has been honest in those deliberations, we think him sadly unfortunate in conveying them to the public. The natural inference from his language is that he had been long, very long, an unwavering believer in the sentiment; and still, from his own showing, he has been almost equally long doubting its truth, and all this, too, has transpired within the period of eight years!

We have no disposition to quarrel with Br. Todd, for changing his views. If he is honestly convinced of the fallacy of Universalism, he should—it is his duty to renounce it at once. But let him preserve consistency—let him do it as becometh the christian, particularly as he professes to have been so powerfully moved by the spirit of Christ—let him frankly and candidly secede, and award to those he leaves behind, the same purity and honesty of purpose that he is so solicitous to have awarded to himself.

We frankly confess we can discover little of the spirit of our divine Master, in the conduct of any one, who, while seceding from any denomination or association of men, labors hard to stamp with infamy those whom he is leaving. If the individual in question was honest himself, in the profession he had left, charity would dictate that those remaining were equally so. And if he was not, he certainly is poorly prepared to set himself up as a judge of his fellows, in like circumstances. These considerations need not be enlarged upon. They must be apparent to every candid mind. The christian at least, of every name, will fully respond to them at heart.

† The writer here speaks of Universalism as he "professed it." What the particular nature of this profession was he has not deemed to tell; but be that as it may, the denomination is not answerable for his mere professions. We doubt not in the least there may be some who profess its doctrines, and still are totally ignorant of its purifying and consolatory principles. Such may look around only to be continually disappointed in their expectations. Ever changing and unsettled in their views, they may pass the rounds of religious, and even skeptical profession, and what does it amount to? Does it prove the fallacy of any or all of the various positions they may have assumed? Rather, does it not afford a melancholy evidence of their own vacillating and unstable minds. We ever regret to see men build so securely upon mere changes in the views of weak, frail man. Even the death-bed declarations of individuals, (who through their whole lives have scarcely given the subject of death and eternity a serious thought, but whose minds, equally diseased perhaps with the body, are worked to the highest pitch of despair by the appalling representations of spiritual counsellors) are heralded forth as evidence as strong as "proofs of Holy-Writ." Can any thing be more absurd than an unreserved reliance on testimony like this? Is my confidence and trust in any particular sentiment to be graduated by the number of adherents that sentiment may happen to possess? A, B, and C, unite in their profession; A, and B, finally secede, and must C, of necessity follow, because the former thus change, or must they all of necessity continue in their original profession because they were thus associated? Suppose the whole world should renounce and denounce Univer-

salism, what should that be to me, farther than to excite a more careful examination of myself—a trial of my own spirit by the unerring rule of the scriptures. It is a subject wholly between myself and my Maker, and if I am satisfied here, though all the world reject it, that cannot affect its truth with me. And if professing christians would look more to the foundations of their own faith, and prescribe less to their neighbors, we are satisfied many of the prominent evils of Christendom would be entirely done away.

‡ He was induced, it seems, to look forward to future generations with much solicitude for the influences of Universalism. Why resort to conjectures on the future? Why not take it as it now is? Look to the "moral, social and religious" condition of places where it now generally prevails. And we ask, with a trifling variation of his own language, whether the effects of the doctrine are not such as to promise substantial good to future ages? We challenge him to make a comparison, justly, with other denominations, which shall be to the disparagement of Universalism. We will even go to himself if he pleases. His faith and confidence has been so strong, that he would even "rejoice in the martyr's privilege of attesting it!" Well, what has been its influence on him. Has it led him to be less "honest, benevolent, social, kind, humble"—or be it remembered, no man can imbibe a sentiment so firmly as to be ready to lay down his life in attestation of it, without its exerting some influence on his mind and conduct—it cannot be inactive. Has it taught him to lie, steal, and to cheat, or even murder his fellow? If it has, we say, (and we are honest in the declaration,) that we rejoice in his conversion, if he has found any thing that will restrain those hellish propensities; and farther, we must acknowledge that there is one being in the wide universe of God, that Universalism is not adapted to. But let us look a moment at the teachings of the doctrine, and we certainly can form some faint idea of its probable influences, when sincerely embraced. It presents to us an all-wise, just and good Being, who is the creator, preserver, and benefactor of us all—a just God and a Savior—abundant in mercy and goodness, but who will by no means clear the guilty—a being exhibited to us under the endearing appellation of Father—a relationship which none can recognise, however abandoned or degraded, but with feelings of the most grateful emotion. It teaches that mankind are brethren, and the equal objects of affection of this all-wise Parent—that his affection as far transcends that of the earthly Parent, as the heavens are higher than the earth, and that because He thus loves us, we should love him, and also love one another. Now what would be the probable consequence of these views if fully believed?—and if not received, no harm could certainly result from them. Would it open the flood gates of vice and iniquity? Would men be "apt to be" less "honest, kind, sociable," &c. But it is unnecessary to pursue this farther. The plain dictates of common sense will show any one that *love invariably begets love*, and if we love God, we shall obey him, and consequently be happy.

§ He ardently desired "to see the boasted good" attributed to Universalism. But the more he looked, the greater "moral waste" he discovered. He could perceive the "blessed influences" nowhere "except on paper!" and yet in this same paragraph, he asserts, "But with these impressions I was obliged still to be a Universalist." We cannot but regard this as a species of dishonesty. If he is influenced at all now by the spirit of christianity, he dares not seriously say, that wherever Universalism has prevailed, he has seen nothing but a "moral waste."

For "two years" or so he had been skeptical, or at least, had but a "cold, dark, and inefficient faith in any" religion. Was so unhappy, "as almost to wish for death," but still "was obliged to be a Universalist!" Such Universalism as this, we know nothing about, and feel that the denomination is not at all responsible for it.

¶ Last winter after an attendance on a protracted meeting, "it begun to be talked he had renounced Universalism." He says he "had not done it!"—although for a year and a half, he had possessed but a "cold, dark, and inefficient faith in any religion"—neither had he "determined to do it," for fear his objections were the "result of some intellectual" (For remainder of Remarks see 6th Page, Folio 294.)

CATHOLIC.

The term *catholic*, like many other terms, has undergone a great change in its meaning. In an early age of the christian church it was used to express an idea of *universalism*. Moshieim, we believe, says—"The term *catholic*, was assumed by the primitive christians, on account of their having embraced the doctrine of the Alexandrian School, that "*all men were brethren, and one God their common Father.*" The same tells us, that the term *catholic*, means *universal*.—Why then not call the Roman Catholic church *the universal church*? And why not call the universalists *CATHOLICS*? If the name, *catholic*, was assumed by the primitive christians to express an idea of the true christian faith; if it meant *universal*; and that universalism consisted in believing that all men were brethren, and God their common Father, were not the primitive christians *universalists* in the full sense of the term?

We admit that the term, *catholic*, does not by any means, imply an idea of universalism at the present day; but if such was its meaning when assumed by the primitive christians, and that they did assume it in consequence of having embraced the doctrine of the Alexandrian School—that all men were brethren and God their common Father, does it not clearly follow that primitive christians were Universalists?

That the primitive christians were thorough-going universalists, there is no doubt, and as they gradually slid off from the doctrine, they changed the use of the term *catholic*, and now it is used merely to distinguish a particular sect of christians from all others. It would be well for those who consider universalism a new thing in the earth, to examine this subject, and see if the very name itself, assumed by the primitive christians, is not an evidence that they were in deed and in truth universalists. If our christian brethren were convinced of this simple fact, they would not speak so lightly of universalism.

Origen, by the orthodox, is considered the first universalist in the christian church; this is far from being the fact; instead of being the first universalist in the church, he is the first christian writer that corrupted the simple doctrine of universalism, as held by primitive christians. He is the first of the early fathers who taught a future state of punishment, but in the true style of the *Mehesna*, he always spoke of it as being limited in its duration, and necessary to qualify souls for paradise. Out of Origen's universalism, catholics built their notion of a purgatory. Turtullian, one of the most gloomy, melancholy fanatics perhaps that ever bore the name of christian, gave the finishing stroke to the present orthodox notion of a place of future and endless punishment, by declaring Origen's *hell* to be of endless duration. The doctrine of Turtullian became *catholic*; *universal*, in the christian church, not because it was believed that all men were brethren, and God their common father, but because it was believed that God and the Devil were two potent belligerents; that each held an interest in the human family; that the kingdom of each would endure forever, and that each of these potentates would continue to maintain his right to his own proper subjects.

Although this pagan notion overran the church from the time of Turtullian, yet in every age of the church, there have been some who have contended for the faith first delivered to the saints; and we have no doubt the time will come, when every vestige of this pagan notion of a hell will be swept from the christian church and universalism be again restored to its pristine purity; then all the various sects and denominations, who bear the christian name, will be one community, and be known only by the name of

catholics; all consider themselves brethren of the same great family, and acknowledge God to be their common Father.—*Sentinel and Star*.

BENEVOLENCE.

There is hardly any thing which can effect a serious and reflecting mind, more than that active goodness, which every where presents itself to our eyes. Our lives, our beings are so interwoven with, and dependent thereon, that existence would be impossible, or intolerable without it. Contemplate the immensity of creation, and observe how it pervades the whole, and the whole emanating from Him, who alone is the source of all that can be enjoyed. Creation smiles with the overflowings of benevolence; every object proclaims the power and wisdom of its author, whilst it furnishes lessons of instruction and knowledge that gratify and enoble our minds. What can charm us more, nay so much, as a right understanding of all that is glorious in design and beneficial in effects? The great and wise Architect has so exquisitely constituted, and adapted the materials of the universe, the one to the other, and each to the powers and perceptions of our minds with so much beauty and skill, as must fill an attentive observer with wonder and admiration. Every thing is subjected to man to heighten his intelligence, realize his supremacy, and consummate his happiness. Who that enjoys these honors and privileges, with their attendant blessings, can be dead to emotions of gratitude to Him, who dispenses them with an unsparing hand. Let us appreciate them and magnify the Giver, who delights to bestow, when we acknowledge our unworthiness to receive in sincerity of heart; for the proper use of what we have, is the due estimation of what is given, and the assured way of increasing it.

Although the bounties of Providence, and the smiles of benevolence are so widely diffused, yet how sad is the reflection that so many live and die insensible to the Giver or his gifts, and obdurately indifferent to the duties of rational creatures, and the pre-eminence of wisdom and virtue. Thus neglected by themselves, the ennobling principles of an enlightened mind, the congenial sympathies of brotherhood, and all the lesser virtues and tender charities which are awakened and fostered in the breast of a good man, constitute no part of their ambition or desires, and when the evening of life comes, they have no honors to reap or enjoy. By them no benevolence is seen, no Providence acknowledged; and where one sees both in happy union, harmoniously effecting the dispensations of its author, the other sees nothing but a blank world. In the one a divine enthusiasm is felt, in the other a degrading apathy. How unenviable is the condition, how unamiable the character of such a man: in the midst of wonders he sees not, and pleasures he cannot relish, except those which are sensual and momentary, and even for these, he has no gratitude to offer.

But those who bask in the sunshine of benevolence, under the auspicious eye of Providence, may congratulate themselves that a protecting arm is extended over them, supplying whatever their conditions and happiness require, till life grows wearisome with age, and surrenders to the grave in hope of immortality beyond it.—*Pioneer and Visitor*.

STORY FROM THE MISHNA OF THE RABBINS.

During the absence of Rabbi Meir from his house his two sons died, both of them of uncommon beauty, and enlightened by the law. His wife bore them to her chamber, laid them upon the bed, and spread a white covering over their bodies. When Rabbi Meir returned, his first inquiry was for his sons. His wife reached to

him a goblet; he praised the Lord at the going out of the Sabbath, drank, and again asked, "Where are my sons, that they too may drink of the cup of blessing?"

"They will not be far off," she replied, and placed food before him that he might eat. He was in a gladsome and genial mood; and when he had said grace after the meal, she thus addressed him: "Rabbi, with thy permission, I would fain propose to thee one question."

"Ask it then, my love," replied he. "A few days ago a person entrusted some jewels to my custody, and now he demands them; should I give them back to him?"

"This is a question," said Rabbi Meir, "which my wife should not have thought it necessary to ask. What! wouldst thou hesitate or be reluctant to restore to every one his own?"

"No," she replied, "but yet I thought it best not to restore them without acquainting thee therewith." She then led him to their chamber, and stepping to the bed, took the white covering from the dead bodies.

"Ah! my sons, my sons!" loudly lamented their father, "my sons! the light of my eyes, and the light of my understanding. I was your father—but ye were my teachers in the law."

The mother turned away and wept bitterly. At length she took the husband by the hand and said—"Rabbi, didst thou not teach me that we must not be reluctant to restore that which was entrusted to our keeping? See, the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away, and blessed be the name of the Lord."

"Blessed be the name of the Lord!" echoed the holy man; "and blessed be his glorious name forever."

THE RELATION OF MAN TO HIS RACE.

The world—as its distant and widely extended climes, with their peculiarities of situation and climate, make together one great whole—so the events that have happened in it, which are happening, and which will happen, are closely linked together, and interwoven as it were, into one unbroken thread. The past has had its influence in forming the present. The present is operating mightily upon the future. The sun, that rides proudly and gloriously, in his splendor and magnificence, over the centre of our globe—calling forth verdure and foliage, in all their beauty and luxuriance, and receiving, in return, the homage of jocund nature, in the thousand forms of her teeming existence, is the same orb, which, in the frozen regions of the poles, just peeps faintly and coldly forth from the extreme horizon, and then hastens away, shuddering at the dreariness which broods over the scene. And so man, as he now stands forth in his beauty and strength, in his present intellectual vigor and moral elevation—the searcher of earth and the explorer of oceans, the student of the skies—is the self-same being, the same in form, in mind, in destination, as the poor, creeping, untutored savage, who, ages ago, in his weakness and ignorance, looked upon the little earth around him as the whole of creation—upon the ocean, as something, he knew not what, and reaching, he knew not where, and who stood, gazing with mingled fear and admiration, as the fires of heaven alternately rose and set, glimmered and faded away. Man is, and ever has been, the same being, in his strength and his weakness, in his knowledge and his ignorance, in his elevation and depression, still the same; ever dependent upon his fellow man, ever operating upon the destiny of the future, ever doing something, either of good or of evil, for those who come after him.

He that dissembleth with God is not to be trusted by man.

CHRISTIAN MESSENGER.

EDITED BY T. J. SAWYER AND P. PRICE, NEW-YORK,
AND ABEL C. THOMAS, PHILADELPHIA.

SATURDAY, JULY 13, 1833.

RELIGIOUS SERVICES

At the Orchard-street Church, and at the New Church in Sixth Avenue, foot of Anity-street commence regularly every Sabbath at half past ten in the morning—half past three in the afternoon, and at eight in the evening.

A CORRECTION.

Br. D. D. Smith, of 'The Universalist,' dropped an editorial hint a few weeks ago concerning the publication of the first religious paper. He says:—"The first religious newspaper ever published in the world, was published in Portsmouth, N.H. in A.D. 1809, by Rev. Elias Smith."

Br. D. D. S. is perhaps ignorant of the fact, that 'The Free Universal Magazine' was commenced June 6, 1793, and continued for the space of one year.—It was edited and published by Ev. Abel Sargent.—A bound copy of the work is in my possession—the gift of a friend. Much information concerning the progress of Universalism, has already been obtained therefrom, and published—and it is proposed to furnish such other extracts from the work as may be deemed interesting and profitable to our denomination.

A. C. T.

CREED OF JOHN MURRAY.

Every man who *thinks*, must have a *creed*—written or unwritten. A *personal* creed is objectionable only so far as it may influence the mind against the reception of additional light, or of more enlarged and consistent views of matters and things.—Universalists, as a distinct denomination, have a *creed*—viz: "I believe in the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." This is the *distinguishing* feature of Universalism. As to minor points there is an honest difference of opinion—but in the leading item we heartily unite. Murray's system was *Calvinism improved*—Winchester's *Arminianism extended*. The result, the same—the means, different. Murray was avowedly a *Universalist*—not simply in fact, but in name. So was Winchester—so is Ballou.

Murray did not believe in future punishment for the sin of this life. Ballou does not. Winchester did.

Murray believed that Christ Jesus endured the entire curse of the law, in the room of all mankind who were justly obnoxious to endless punishment. Winchester believed that no man can deserve endless punishment; and that every individual must suffer the consequences of *his own* sins. Ballou is of the same opinion.

Winchester held a future disciplinary (and of course *limited*) punishment for the sins of this life. Ballou confines all punishment for sin, and all reward for virtue, to this mortal life—beholding, in eternal blessedness, the *free gift* of God to all mankind.

Murray and Winchester disagreed on some points of doctrine, and were united on others. Ballou unites with Murray in some particulars, and with Winchester in others. And on some points he disagrees with both. But in the grand and glorious consummation—UNIVERSAL SALVATION—there is a perfect oneness of sentiment, between Murray, Winchester, and Ballou—yes, between all Universalists.

I commenced this article, intending simply to in-

troduce the following Creed of John Murray. It was handed me two years ago, by a friend, who copied it from "an original certificate in the possession of ———." I am sorry I did not think of transcribing it for insertion in Thomas Whittemore's new and much improved edition of the Life of Murray.

A. C. T.

"In the knowledge of the salvation we have in Christ Jesus, we can only find rest and peace. Nothing, therefore, can save us from heart rending misery, but a full persuasion of the truth manifested in the Gospel, which is, that 'in Jesus the promised seed we are blessed with all spiritual blessings.' Should we live and die unbelievers of this divine truth, we live and die in our sin, (viz. in our unbelief,) and so living and so dying, we must of necessity be unhappy; we must be slaves to fear, and fear, as saith the Apostle, hath torment. But this Hell of misery, suffered by the soul in a separate state, is not a punishment inflicted in order to expiate or atone for our offences. To suppose this, would be to deny the Lord that bought us—to deny (what is most solemnly declared in the communion service of the church of England, where it is expressly declared,) that Jesus made, by himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. The Hell that unbelieving sinners suffer, therefore, is not for, but in consequence of, their sin of unbelief. When this unbelief, as the cause, is done away by the knowledge of God, who is the eternal life of the world, then misery, the effect, will cease of course. Blessed, therefore, in life or in death, in the body or out of the body, are the people who know the joyful sound. They shall walk in the light of God's countenance; and thus to walk is heaven."

That they all may be one—that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

Our Saviour died that the world might believe and be saved; and what has he told his followers to do for the attainment of this great object? It is not only our duty, but our privilege, our happiness to *be one*; but alas! how often is our heart pained by hearing that the ministers, or children of Christ, are contending respecting points of theology, a belief in which themselves do not consider essential to salvation, though they may view it "a more excellent way."—We, however, find the apostles too much engaged in preaching Christ and him crucified, to dispute about mint, annise, and cummin; and even the children of this world are in their generation wiser. We do not hear of Unitarians and Universalists disagreeing among themselves, and opposing each other, even though they may differ in opinion on minor points. This disgrace, this stumbling block to our holy religion, appears to be left to those who profess most to love and honor their Savior, and that, too, in direct opposition to his prayer, which is our motto. "Whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? If ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another."

An intelligent Jew, on being urged by the writer to become a Christian, replied, "that it would be time enough for him, when Christians were agreed among themselves what to believe." How long shall those who themselves walk in the light, cast stumbling blocks in the way of the blind? All the truths necessary to salvation are so plain, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein; and if some gifted minds enjoy peculiar views of certain doctrines, why attempt to bring all their brethren to their standard, unless they are fundamental, and essential to salvation? If they all hold Christ the head, and would bring sinners

to the foot of the cross, let us wish them God speed; and if our opinions have a better tendency to promote this blessed result, we should prove it by our fruits, by so praying and laboring for a revival in that part of the vineyard where God has placed us, that he will own and bless, and pour down his blessing on souls around us. It is where "brethren dwell together in unity," that "the Lord commands the blessing, even life, for evermore." But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law, for they are unprofitable and vain."

We extract the foregoing from an article in the last Evangelist. We admire the writers frankness in acknowledging the inconsistencies so papable among professing christians. His article contains much truth, and some of his remarks will admit of a very general application. For instance, if some do enjoy peculiar views on certain doctrines, why should they attempt to bring all their brethren precisely to their own standard. As he justly says, if their "opinions have a better tendency" let them prove it by their fruits." This is the Savior's test. "By their fruits ye shall know them"—not by their professions. It is the only safe rule of judgment, and certainly it is the only needed one. If an individual exhibits the works of righteousness, not all the distinctive terms in Christendom, applied to him, can alter the character of this "fruit."

As a general thing, however, we have never found limitarians willing to practice upon this rule. Talk to them of morality, and if it is without a definite profession, or one of the right stamp, they will consign its possessor to remediless woe at once. Yea, the very possession of this morality, agreeably to their teaching, would even sink the individual into still deeper damnation!

The Universalist, above all others, holds to "Christ the head" of all; but entreat, in reference to them, that "every 'Shibboleth' among christians may be sacrificed on the altar of love to Christ," and we are unchristianized without ceremony; or, at the best, we are fully certified that their remarks include ONLY "Evangelical Christians."

Confined to themselves and what a comment does their conduct afford upon the writer's text! "That they all may be one," &c. The political world scarcely ever witnessed greater strife than is apparent at this moment in this portion of the christian world. A treaty of peace, we know, is frequently entered into between them, for the evident purpose of raising excitements, or, to crush in their might, poor Universalism, but no sooner do they get fairly under way than they begin to quarrel among themselves, about the fruits, or the honor in the case, and exhibit therein towards each other any thing but a christian spirit. Well might the Jew reply, "That it would be time enough for him, when christians were agreed among themselves!"

Let professed Christians practice the precepts of their Master—let them exert themselves in pulling down, instead of erecting, middle walls of partition between man and man—let them estimate men by their conduct—the fruits—instead of by profession, and they will find little time, occasion, or inclination to dispute about "mint, annise and cummin," but on the contrary, reap a rich reward in the manifest addition to our social joys and happiness. P.

A QUESTION.

How can the gospel be a better covenant, established upon better promises, if it reveals a state of future wretchedness unknown to the dispensation of the law?

A. C. T.

REMARKS ON MR. TODD'S RENUNCIATION.

[Concluded from page 3, folio 291.]

hallucinations, or temporary prejudice." An important consideration here arises—Had he any Universalism to renounce? Is he now sure that his counsels are not the "result" of some "intellectual hallucination" or "hypochondriacal affection." In this connexion, also, he says that he felt it improper "to urge Universalism." Why, then, not be honest at the time, and say so frankly; and not attempt to teach others, while by his own showing, he so much needed to be taught himself.

¶ He alludes to an article copied by him from the *Trumpet*, and says it is not a misrepresentation of the condition of Universalist societies, so far as he is acquainted with them. Now we say his "acquaintance" must be very, very limited, if he can indulge any "affection" for Universalists, and honestly make this assertion.

*"He would not "speak harshly" of Universalists, and an evidence of this kindness and charity on his part, is furnished as follows—He thinks it would be much fairer for them, (Universalists) to say at once they did not regard the Bible, and only used it to dress up a system of palpable infidelity! Does he judge the denomination by himself? Has he merely used the Bible "to dress up a system of palpable infidelity?" If so, we have only to say he was totally ignorant of Universalism—"He went out from us, because he was not of us."

¶ It is puerile, childish in the extreme, for him to talk of Universalists "coming out against him with a vengeance!" Universalists, (and when we say this, we mean Universalists, and not those who have only a "cold, dark, and inefficient faith" in any religion,) have nothing to do with "vengeance." Let him satisfactorily settle the matter with his own conscience and we are well aware that the frowns or smiles of his fellow beings are of little consequence to him. Universalists, he may be assured, will not interfere, farther than to exonerate themselves from unjust implication.

¶ "I know of no argument against eternal punishment that can be drawn from a fair construction of the scriptures." It really seems to us he would have rendered a much more important service to the cause of genuine religion, if he had occupied a share of his long article in giving the arguments, from scripture, in favor of eternal punishment, rather than in declaiming against Universalism. If he has known any thing of the sentiment, he knows that its favorite motto is, "to the law and to the testimony." The reader cannot, however, be otherwise than surprised, to perceive that he has not adduced one single scriptural reason for the course he has taken.

We cannot estimate the interest we should feel in seeing a person, who had once been firmly and understandingly established in Universalism, attempt seriously to prove its opposite. We have heard it suggested, and we are half inclined to the same opinion, that it is utterly impossible for one who has tasted the sweets of gospel light and liberty—who has fully partook of the rich pleasures and enjoyments which the Universalist faith is calculated to bestow, and again return to the beggarly elements of Partialism. Why, look at it, kind reader. If he is a Universalist, he believes in a Deity who is *all-wise, just, and good*—full of mercy and kindness to his creature man, without partiality and without hypocrisy—ordering all events in his moral government so as to result in the final purification and restoration of all his intelligent creation to holiness and happiness. Now let him seriously take the opposite, and he must of necessity believe in a Deity

who is not just, wise, and good—who is merciful and kind to only a part of his creatures—who is partial, at least, and who is so ordering his moral government that it will finally result in consigning to the regions of unutterable misery and despair, by far the greater portion of his intelligent creation. In the name of every thing good, how is he to derive joy and consolation in this faith? Or where can he find even the necessary proof to his mind? Shall he go to inspiration? there he is assured "the Lord is good unto all and his tender mercies are over all his works." Shall he go the book of nature?—there joy beams forth in every field, and forest, and flower. Shall he consult his own experience?—each returning day but adds new evidence to his mind that he is in the hands of a kind and merciful protector and benefactor. Go where you will, and to the eye of reflection, you meet one universal testimony that the "Lord is good."

We have sometimes, when it has been announced that a Universalist has changed his faith, set down to a consideration of the subject, and brought it home to ourselves. We have supposed it our own case—we have gone in imagination over the whole field of probable evidence to prove the doctrines of partialism, and we have only returned, (if possible,) with stronger convictions of the truth of our present views. In fact, we could never find a starting place in proof of the opposite. Like the dove sent out after the deluge, we could not even find a resting place, but were driven back, weary and exhausted, to the "ark" of the immutable promises of God to the children of men. Thus it is, and thus it ever will be, except when the perceptions of persons are so perverted by the creeds and commandments of men, that they can imagine sweets in the greatest bitter.

We might follow the writer through the remainder of his article, in examining his gratuitous vindication of his motives—in considering his "main" objection to Universalism, (its inefficiency to reform the wicked) and in investigating the doctrine which he seems to lay down, that it is useless to preach the love of God to the wicked, but we have already extended these remarks to a great length, and perhaps an unreasonable one. We have thought, however, some notice necessary—at least that it might be profitable to call more immediate attention to it. For aught we know, Br. Todd has stood fair in the denomination, and whether honest, therefore, or dishonest in this act, it is certainly worthy of some consideration. He remarks that "the grand object of all religion is to make men good." So say we; or, that it should be. And if he is sincere in the course he has taken, and that course is calculated to make him better and happier, we never could, consistently with our feelings, war with him simply for his change. We only object to the least appearance, in any one, of a disposition to rise on the ruins of another.

We thus far have been, and we hope we ever shall be, the unyielding advocates of a perfect, unrestrained freedom in matters of faith. Our motto has been, let men be judged by their conduct—not by profession, and it has been a source of much gratification to us, through our life thus far, that notwithstanding the general opposition to our views, we have met with many among other denominations to whom we could in sincerity extend the hand of fellowship. And our highest wish and desire is, that our efforts may be so directed as to tend to a constant increase of this number. But we must close, by requesting the reader's indulgence for the space we have occupied with this subject. It has gone much beyond our first intention, but may not be wholly useless.

We find the following article on oaths, by a French writer, with the accompanying remarks of Br. Leavitt, in the last Evangelist. We are gratified that the columns of that paper are opened to that subject, and think that the remarks of the editor, (Br. L.) give evidence that our New School Presbyterian brethren are adopting more rational and liberal views on one subject at least. When it becomes an established opinion that "government and law should depend simply on the honesty of the people," we hope the testimony of Universalists will not be rejected merely for opinion sake.

THE EVILS OF THE OATH.

[Translated for the New-York Evangelist, from *Le Semeur*, of May 8, 1833.]

It is painful to remark in studying the history of the people of Europe, to what a degree they have prostituted the oath among them. To the eyes of reason, exacting the guarantee of an oath, is to treat those of whom it is demanded, as men on whose veracity or good faith it is impossible to rely, unless their conscience is frightened by the idea of the most solemn engagement possible. It moreover overthrows all the principles of morals, and regards truth in the ordinary relations of life, as of little importance. Why should the simple affirmation of an individual have less weight before a tribunal than any where else? Many people fear less to lie than to perjure themselves. Is not this because the law of their country has taught them to make this difference? It might even be affirmed that the usage of calling men to take an oath in court, is of all the exterior causes that propagate falsity and lying, the most dangerous and the most active. It would be easy to speak of many other inconveniences of the oath; but we only wish to exhibit the question under one of its aspects.

REMARK.—We present the above to our readers, because it strikes us as a matter worthy of consideration. We look at the moral influence of our multiplied oaths, we look at the difficulty of deciding in regard to the testimony of those who profess to deny the belief of all future retribution for false swearing, we look at the case of those who claim to be citizens, and office holders, and witnesses, notwithstanding they disown all religious obligation to their Creator. Perhaps the easiest way is to wipe out the whole system, and let government and law depend simply on the honesty of the people. To a certain extent, it is with men's moral principles as with their memories—the more you trust them, the more they justify your confidence. At any rate, we do not doubt that the legislatures of our states will ere long find themselves obliged to look the question in the face, precisely as it is presented by this French writer.—*Ed. Evangelist.*

NEW SOCIETIES.

Have recently been formed in Hastings, and New Haven, this state, and in Phillipstown Mass.

DEDICATIONS.

The New Universalist Meeting house in Buffalo, was dedicated to the worship of Almighty God on the 5th ult. Brs. Dean, Sadler and Reese took part in the exercises.

The Meeting House of the first Universalist Society in Danvers, was dedicated on the 28th ult.

CONVERSIONS IN THE MINISTRY.

Br. Jason Lewis, of Rushford, communicates to the *Edt's* of the Magazine and Advocate, Utica, the pleasing information of four additional preachers to the cause of Universalism. Their names and residences as follows. Wm. M'Leand, Pike, Alleghany Co.; Judah Babcock, Hume, same County; Orrin Marsh, Castile, Genesee Co.; and a person

by the name of Todd, Elliottville, Cattaraugus Co. The first was formerly a preacher among the Methodists for 13 or 14 years. The second has been a public speaker about 15 years, the first 6 of which he was connected with the Free-will Baptists, and since then has not been attached to any sect, till his avowal of Universalism. The third was a preacher in the Christian denomination, and the fourth a lay preacher among the Calvinistic Baptists. Br. Lewis states also, that a Society was formed in Pike last winter, in which Br. M'Leland labors one half of the time.

WESTERN RESERVE ASSOCIATION.

This Association met at Parkman, Geauga Co. Ohio, on the 7th ult. Conferred ordination on Brs. Morgan L. Wisner, Jonathan M. Tracy and Edson Beals. Brs. Kneeland Townsend and Russell Tomlinson of this state, were present and took part in the exercises.

MOHAWK RIVER ASSOCIATION.

This Association met at Floyd Corner, on the 12th ult. Passed a resolution requesting Clerks of Societies to furnish immediately to Br. S. W. Fuller, Standing Clerk, the Statistical information called for by the resolution of the state Convention, at its late sitting. Adjourned to meet at Eaton's Bush, on the 2d Wednesday and following Thursday in June 1834.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONVENTION.

This body met in Warner N. H. 26th ult. Four preachers were received into fellowship. Next session at Meredith Bridge, 4th Wednesday June, 1834.

THE MASS. CHARITABLE SOCIETY

For the relief of the widows and orphans of Universalist Clergymen, met according to adjournment in Haverhill, on the 5th ult. The following officers as provided by the constitution, were chosen;

Hosea Ballou, President.
Sylvanus Cobb, Secretary.
Hosea Ballou 2nd. Corresponding Secretary.
Thomas Whittemore, Treasurer.
Sebastian Streeter,
Calvin Gardner,
Benj. Whittemore,
John Moore,
Massena B. Ballou,

Directors.

The Society adjourned to meet at the time and place of the next meeting of the Boston Association of Universalists.

Original.

A "STRONG OBJECTION."

The opposers of Universal Salvation not unfrequently make the assertion, that 'Universalism is a good doctrine to live by, but it will not do to die by.' Men may live in the possession of this faith, but alas a death-bed, which is a detector of the heart, sweeps away this 'strong delusion.' This is called a 'strong objection' against the Abrahamic faith.

The objector ought to know and understand what Universalism is, before he makes this sweeping affirmation. He should learn that it is an unshaken confidence in the goodness, and love, and grace of Almighty God, it is the firm belief that He is the Father—the faithful benefactor of the family of man: that the veriest insects which grovel in the dust, those that the human eye cannot perceive, up to the cherubic choir that 'adore and burn' before the throne of God, experiences his smile and live on his bounty.

It is a faith which was 'accounted for righteousness unto Abraham, and he was called the child of God,' that 'all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.' It is a belief in the truth of

Divine revelation, and the heavenly mission of Jesus Christ, and implicit acknowledgment of the doctrines taught by him who 'taught as never man taught;' it is a faith that in the fullness of times all things shall be subjected to Christ by that power through which he raised the dead, healed the sick, and cast out devils; that God shall be all in all, that grace shall reign coextensively with the dominion of sin, that 'this corruptible shall put on incorruption and this mortal immortality, and that death shall be swallowed up in victory.' It contends that 'Christ gave himself a ransom for all, that he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world,' that 'God is a just God' yet the 'Savior of all men,' and that He will in his own due time 'finish transgression, make an end of sin,' and bring in universal righteousness and consequent happiness.

These are some of the prominent features of Universalism, and if as our Savior declares 'he that believeth shall be saved,' and if as John affirms 'whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God,' and as Paul declares 'by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God,' what better faith is there than Universalism? If a confiding trust in the mercy and power of the Almighty Parent, and a faith in his son, are not sufficient to solace the dying man, will the belief in endless torments 'make a dying bed as soft as downy pillows are?'

When Peter requested that he might go to Jesus on the water, and when about to sink he was reminded of his doubting, was it a faith in the ability and willingness of Christ, that made him cry out I perish? No it was a want of it. Is it Universalism, or a faith in God, and a trust in his grace and mercy that causes the heart to quake with fear when death is approaching? Is it this that produces the torturing apprehension that 'the soul will be a frightened ghost among the inmates of an eternal hell?' Is it Universalism that plants thorns on the pillow of the dying, and spreads over them the darksome curtain of despair? No, it is a want of it. Will a firm reliance on the benignity of heaven, a strong faith in the efficiency and plenitude of God's grace, a vigorous hope in the accomplishment of the rich promises of the gospel, not do to die by, then we ask what will? Is Partialism any better to die by than this? Is the doctrine of Election, is the faith in the certainty and eternity of hell torments for any, calculated to soothe the dying man? Is the notion that myriads of wailing souls are companions of fiends, and vassals of a malignant personal devil in an endless hell 'a good doctrine to die by?' Does the sentiment that an awful day of judgment is coming when these wretched victims shall be summoned before the divine tribunal, and then 're-turned into hell,' inspire the heart with holy confidence and resignation?

My candid friend go learn what the doctrine is, which you tell us augments 'the pain,' destroys 'the bliss' of dying, and then judge which is the best to die by. It is the peculiar opinions of Partialism not Universalism that adds a pang to the departing spirit. Faith, hope, and charity uniting their benign influence in the soul, enables the dying to say, 'Lord now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace for mine eyes have seen thy salvation.'

But having seen that Universalism is good to die by, we should remark a word on the strange inconsistency which this objection involves. Is a doctrine that is said to have been 'preached by a certain personage in the garden of Eden'—a doctrine which 'says to the sinner go on, all will be well,' a good doctrine to live by? Is a doctrine which opens wide the portals of iniquity, which is an 'abominable heresy,' good to practice among men? Is it 'very good to live

by?' We frequently hear it said that the fruits of Universalism instead of being 'righteousness and peace,' are 'infidelity licentiousness and suicide.' Do our opponents believe what they say, when they tell us that this doctrine is 'good to live by?' then we hope that they will no longer proclaim that Universalism is a 'demoralizing sentiment,' and their own experience must teach them that however ironically they may speak when they commend our doctrine, the duties of the gospel are just, a faith in its promises is consolatory and cheering, the hope of a resurrection to a blissful immortality is joy; this is the Universalism which we profess. Christians judge ye whether it will do to die by. May our opponents be brought to a knowledge of this truth; that the sentiments which we advocate and cherish we consider to be the pure doctrines of Christianity, the revealed will of our heavenly Father.

B. B. H.

CLINTON LIBERAL INSTITUTE.

The Summer term of the Clinton Liberal Institute, commenced on the fourth Monday in May last, and will continue, without vacation, to the 26th September. It has now about sixty students. The building is new, spacious and convenient, the situation pleasant and healthy, and the terms and course of instruction such as warrant the most successful progress of the pupils. More than one hundred students can be well accommodated.

Lowest price of tuition, for 14 weeks, \$4.00

Highest " " " " 6.00

Board and washing, on an average, \$1.50 per week.

No student received for less than half a term.

Mr. R. C. THUMMER, Principal and Professor of Languages.

" G. R. PERKINS, Professor of Mathematics.

" W. E. MANLY, assistant teacher.

The Ladies' School attached to the Institute is kept in a building erected for that purpose, and will accommodate about seventy scholars. It has about thirty pupils, all of whom will board in private families.

Lowest price of tuition, per quarter \$3.00

Highest " " " " 5.00

Music, drawing and French language, separate charges.

Board and washing, on an average, \$1.50 per week.

MISS ALMIRA MEECH, Instructress.

Clinton, June 1833.

MARRIED,

In Brooklyn, on the 5th inst. by the Rev. Mr. Price, Jerome B. Lobdell, of Brookfield, Ct. and Catharine S. Bouton of this city.

DIED,

In Norwalk, Conn. on the 4th inst. Catharine Rockwell, wife of Mr. Raymond Rockwell, aged about 40. The funeral was attended on the 5th, by Br. Andrews, of Philadelphia.

RELIGIOUS NOTICES.

Br. S. J. Hillyer will preach at the Callowhill-st. Church, Philadelphia, the 2d (to-morrow) and 3d Sabbaths in this month.

Br. R. Smith, of Hartford, will preach at Long Ridge, on Sunday 14th inst. (to-morrow,) and at North Salem in the evening.

Familiar Conversations.

Just received and for sale at this office, "Twelve Familiar Conversations between Inquirer and Universalist," &c. &c. By Russell Streeter. Price 50 cents. Subscribers will please call and get their copies.

Reflections on Revivals of Religion.

Just received and for sale at this office, a small pamphlet entitled "Reflections on Revivals of Religion, by a friend to Religion."

Original.

MEMORY.

Addressed to a Lady of New-York.

BY JOHN PERRY—PHILAD.

There's a time, when the soul, full of exquisite feeling,

Reposes serene like some sweet bird at rest;
When not even the sigh of the summer wind stealing,

Can ruffle the plumage that covers its breast.

'Tis when Memory is holding her mirror before us,
And the days that are gone, with their light—and their shade,

Pass full oft in review, while they seem to restore us
The friends and the joys that were formed but to fade.

On some scene in that mirror we'll linger the longest,
It may picture some pleasures, the best we have known;

Or some trusted friend, whom the heart had lov'd strongest,

Whose joys and whose sorrows we felt as our own.

Such moments are precious, the heart, overflowing
With feelings as pure and chaste as the ray,
Which the moon on some smooth lake unconscious
Is throwing,

Melts at once into sadness, and mirth dies away.

Thus, when in life's winter, before death comes o'er me,

Past moments of pleasure to mind I recall,
Those whil'd in thy presence, will linger before me,
The purest, the best, and the brightest of all!

TWILIGHT MUSINGS.

"Child of the bright and cloudless brow,
I once like thee was young,
And then o'er nature was the glow
Of sunlight beauty hung,
But chilling years have changed the scene,
That world of richest dye
Hath vanished as its hues had been,
A cold dream's mockery.

"I've seen man's boasted strength decay,
And beauty's flush and bloom,
And oft I've seen the spring's array
O'ershadowed deep with gloom.
And I have marked of fairest things,
That they the soonest fade,
That unto life a poison clings,
And therefore am I sad."

I well remember him of mild eyes, of noble brow, and manly form—whose ever varying and eloquent countenance was a true index of the mind—of the pure and guileless spirit that was within him. We were in the same class at W— He was young. Scarcely had twenty two summers smiled upon him when our acquaintance began. The prospect then was, that long, long years would pass away ere any thing should occur to interrupt the joys of our companionship. The rugged path of science lay before us; its steep ascent was to be climbed, and, if possible, its far off and lofty summit was to be gained. We joined hands and ardently pressed onward. But he paused almost at the very outset. There is one day, of which I have still a vivid recollection, which passed a few months after our acquaintance began. It was a day of autumn. The Sabbath-like stillness that reigned around; the dun and sombre appearance of the forest that stretched far away to the north; the slumbering waters of the broad river on which here and there a "sere leaf" was floating; the melancholy chirp and hum of the insect tribe; the general aspect of repose which spread out upon every thing; the autumnal soberness and quietude, in fine, which no pen can describe; seem all around me now as they were then. The college bell rung us into the chapel for declamation. I remember nothing of the declamation at that time save the performance of

him of whom I now speak. Nor do I even remember, definitely, the piece which he recited on that occasion. The general sentiment was like that of the poetry which I have placed at the head of these remarks. But his manner—his look—the solemnity and pathos of his utterance—how he stood—how his eyes beamed—how his expressive countenance changed with the changing sentiment of the poetry which he was pronouncing. All this I never can forget, I never wish to. There he stood in the strength of his years. Health mantled his cheeks, and hope and promise sat prominent on his ample brow. But he stood there for the LAST TIME. He stood there and uttered that which is but an amplification of the sentiment of inspiration—

"Men fleeth as a shadow and continueth not."

There he stood, the prophet of his own doom, the foreteller of his own early and lamented fall. Who can tell what strange and mysterious feelings might at that time have come over his spirit. What premonitions he then had—what indefinable emotions we know not. That there was, however, in his mind, at the time, some presentiment of a great and momentous event, then just at hand, I cannot doubt. Be this as it may, he left the stage in the chapel on that day for the last time. He went out and looked upon the faded scenery of autumn with musing eye. So, thought he, fares it with man. The summer of his years is soon succeeded by the chills and the decays of autumn. The honors and the pleasures of earth grow green around him to-day, are withered to-morrow. Change follows change with never ceasing constancy. To-day the smiles and promises of hope shed upon us their sunniest influence, and brighten each passing hour into gladness; to-morrow, the scene is changed, is entirely reversed. To day, the beacon light of high promise beams out brightly over the dark waves of existence; to-morrow that light is quenched, and those waves roll on more darkly than before.

The winter vacation arrived, and its few weeks soon passed away. Again spring came, and we returned to the banks of the K—. But our friend, our class-mate, had not gone away to spend the vacation at home. We had left him sick in his room. And when we came back in the spring he was no more! In the winter he died. On a cold day in December the college bell tolled. The hearse moved away from the yard, and it bore him to the grave. When I came back, I went to his room; all was hushed. I knocked, no answer was given. I knocked again and still no sound came to my ear. I turned me away in sadness, and went to the place of his grave. And then as the tears fell fast on the unconscious dust, I found relief to the imprisoned sorrows of my spirit. He died young, but he was ripened for heaven. He was ready, though life was in its freshness, to be offered. He went unreluctantly at the call of his Redeemer, to join the hosts of the blessed. I could muse long on the mournful theme, but the shadows of more than twilight gather around me.

Lowell Evangelist.

This is an agreeable world after all. If we could only bring ourselves to look at the objects which surround us in their true light, we would see beauty where we before beheld deformity, and listen to harmony where we before could hear nothing but discord. To be sure, there is a great deal of anxiety and vexation—we cannot expect to sail on a summer sea forever—yet if we preserve a calm eye and steady hand, we can so trim our sails and manage our helm, as to avoid the quicksands and weather the storms that threaten shipwreck. We are mem-

bers of one grand family; we are all travelling the same road, and we will all arrive at the same goal. We breathe the same free air—we are subject to the same emotions—we live on the same bounty, and will all lie down on the bosom of our common mother. It is not becoming, then, that brother should hate brother; it is not proper that friend should deceive friend—it is not right that neighbor should injure neighbor. We pity that man who can harbor enmity against his fellow; he loses half the enjoyment of life; he embitters his own existence. Let us tear from our eyes the colored medium that invests every object with the green view of jealousy and suspicion; turn a deaf ear to the tale of scandal; breathe the spirit of charity from our lips; and from our hearts let the rich gushings of human kindness swell up as from a fountain—so the "Golden Age" will become no fiction, and the "Islands of the Blessed" bloom in more than Hesperian beauty.—*Marietta Adv.*

PROSPECTUS

For the 3d vol. of the Messenger, to be published simultaneously at New-York and Philadelphia, under the title of

NEW-YORK CHRISTIAN MESSENGER AND PHILADELPHIA UNIVERSALIST.

The proposed change in the manner of publication of the Messenger, induces us thus early to present proposals for the Third Volume. No essential change will be made in the course of the paper, unless it may be to avail ourselves of every possible opportunity of increasing the talent and interest in its columns. It will, therefore, in the language it has ever held forth to the world, continue to "plead the cause of a slandered and persecuted denomination of Christians—the UNIVERSALISTS;" endeavor to inspire confidence among its friends, and to induce as far as possible the thoughtless and unconcerned, and even opposers, to come forward into the field of examination and "reason together" on the great and glorious doctrines of a world's reconciliation to God.

Its motto may be, perhaps, the surest index of its character. It breathes neither wrath nor fury to the children of men, but on the contrary, it points to a peaceful messenger on the mountain top, proclaiming "good tidings;" and "publishing peace." "*How beautiful upon the mountains, are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace.*"

With unfeigned gratitude to the Universalist public for the many tokens of approbation bestowed upon our paper for the 18 months it has now been in existence, we submit these Proposals for the third volume, referring simply to the past, as a pledge for the future.

CONDITIONS.

The "N. Y. Christian Messenger and Philadelphia Universalist," will be published simultaneously in New-York and Philadelphia, every Saturday morning, on a royal sheet, quarto form, and close print, at \$2 per annum, in advance, or \$2 50 if not paid within the first six months. The first No. will appear on the first Saturday in Nov. next.

Subscribers in New-York and Philadelphia will be promptly served by Carriers, and all possible care will be observed in the Mailing department, that subscribers may regularly receive their papers.

The publishing office in New-York is at No. 2 and 3 Marble Building, Chatham Square, and in Philadelphia, for the present, at No. 132 Chestnut-street adjoining the United States Bank.

P. PRICE,

Publisher and Proprietor

New-York, June 1833.

P. PRICE, PRINTER,

Nos. 2 and 3 Marble Buildings, Chatham-Square, where JOB PRINTING will be neatly executed, on reasonable terms. Orders solicited.